DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 845 JC 010 221

TITLE	Quality Indicator System Report.
INSTITUTION	Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver.; Front Range Community Coll., Westminster, CO.
PUB DATE	1999-12-00
NOTE	30p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://frcc.cccoes.edu/~IR/qireport/index.html.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Educational Quality; *Evaluation Criteria; *Institutional Evaluation; *School Effectiveness; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Indicators; *Front Range Community College CO

ABSTRACT

This report is a product of the implementation of a quality indicator system for Colorado's public higher education system. In 1999, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education established a core set of nine indicators, for which data were gathered and benchmarks were identified for measuring performance in terms of these benchmarks. The first portion of this report describes these nine indicators, presents institutional data, and provides benchmarks where applicable. The nine indicators include: (1) graduation rates and credits for degree; (2) faculty instructional productivity; (3) freshmen persistence; (4) achievement rates; (5) lower division class size; (6) approved and implemented diversity plan; (7) institutional support costs; and (8-9) and institutional-specific indicators. For example, Colorado State University's eighth indicator was percentage increase in federally funded research awards, and the ninth was rating of professional veterinary medicine program. Data for each of the nine core indicators constitute a baseline against which annual improvement or maintenance of achievements can be measured. In addition, where applicable, national or statewide benchmarks are used to measure achievement compared to institutions with similar characteristics. The second portion of the report describes a more extensive and comprehensive set of indicators for the eight statewide goals and twenty-three required institutional actions outlined in SB 99-229. (JA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 845

Quality Indicator System Report

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:

G. Reinardy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TC010221

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

QUALITY INDICATOR SYSTEM REPORT

December, 1999

Introduction

In 1996, the Colorado General Assembly passed HB 96-1219 – the Higher Education Quality Assurance Act – which outlined the General Assembly's expectations for a quality indicator system for Colorado's public higher education system. During 1997-98, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) implemented HB 96-1219 culminating in a report to the General Assembly in December, 1998 on the results of the first year of implementation.

In the subsequent 1999 legislative session, SB 99-229 was passed and signed into law by Governor Owens in May, 1999. SB 99-229 refined HB 96-1219 and identified eight statewide goals and twenty-three specific required institutional actions for a revised quality indicator system.

Since June, 1999, the CCHE and governing boards have worked collaboratively to implement SB 99-229. This implementation took two forms. First, a core set of nine indicators was established for use during 1999. Referred to as the "short list", data were gathered for these indicators and benchmarks identified for measuring performance in terms of these benchmarks. The first portion of this report describes these nine indicators, presents the institutional data, and provides benchmarks where applicable.

The second approach followed in implementing SB 99-229 was to establish a more extensive and comprehensive quality indicator system for the future. It includes a set of twenty-nine indicators for the eight statewide goals and twenty-three required institutional actions outlined in SB 99-229. This quality indicator system is described in the second portion of this report. The nine indicators comprising the "short list" are included in this more extensive and comprehensive system.

Colorado is one of thirty-seven states having some type of a quality indicator or performance measurement system for the public institutions of higher education in the state. The quality indicator system for the future outlined in the second portion of this report incorporates several indicators commonly utilized across states. For example, graduation rates are an indicator included in the systems of thirty-two states, faculty workload/productivity in twenty-four states, and passing rates or scores on tests and licensure examinations in twenty-one states.

Data for each of the nine core indicators constitute a baseline against which annual improvement or maintenance of achievements can be measured. In addition, where applicable, national or statewide benchmarks are used to measure achievement compared to institutions with similar characteristics (e.g., role and mission, admission standards, enrollment size, funding support, etc.).

ED 010221

Along with common indicators utilized by other states are indicators unique to Colorado in terms of the expectations and required institutional actions specified in SB 99-229. Also unique is the focus of the quality indicator system on undergraduate education. Graduate level education is not a component of the system. Neither is research, other than academic research carried out at the undergraduate level involving undergraduate students.

This focus on undergraduate education should not be misconstrued as a devaluing by the CCHE of graduate education or research. Both are important components of Colorado's higher education system and both are supported by CCHE. For the time being, however, and at least during its initial stages of development and implementation, the quality indicator system is focused on "…achieving a high quality, efficient, and expeditious undergraduate education." (23-13-104, CRS)

Since the roles and mission of the institutions are important aspects of the quality indicator system, these statutory purposes are presented in the following table. The statutory role and mission statements include each institution's admissions selectivity, since performance expectations and benchmarks associated with an institution often differ institution to institution depending on the admissions selectivity of the institution.

INSTITUTION	STATUTORY ROLE & MISSION STATEMENT WITH ADMISSIONS SELECTIVITY
CSM Colorado School of Mines	…a specialized baccalaureate and graduate institution with high admission standards…the primary institution…offering energy, mineral, and material science and mineral engineering degrees at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. CRS 23-41-105
CSU Colorado State University	…a comprehensive graduate research university with high admission standards offering a comprehensive array of undergraduate programs consistent with the tradition of land grant universities. CRS 23-31-101
UBC University of Colorado-Boulder	…a comprehensive graduate research university with high admission standards which offers a comprehensive array of undergraduate programs. CRS 23-20-101(1)(a)
UCCS University of Colorado – Colorado Springs	…a comprehensive baccalaureate liberal arts and sciences institution with selective admission standards…shall provide selected professional programs and such graduate programs as will serve the needs of the Colorado Springs metropolitan area. CRS 23-20-101(1)(c)
UCD University of Colorado – Denver	…a comprehensive baccalaureate liberal arts and sciences institution with high admission standards…shall provide selected professional programs and such graduate programs…as will serve the needs of the Denver metropolitan area. CRS 23-20-101(1)(b)
UCHSC University of Colorado-Health Sciences Center	…a specialized professional institution offering baccalaureate and graduate programs in health-related disciplines and professions. CRS 23-20-101(1)(d)

UNC University of Northern Colorado	…a general baccalaureate and specialized graduate research university with selective admissions standards…the primary institution for undergraduate and graduate teacher education…shall offer masters and doctoral programs primarily in the field of education. CRS 23-40-101
ASC Adams State College	…a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards…shall offer limited professional programs, Hispanic programs, undergraduate education degrees, masters' level programs, and two-year transfer programs…shall not offer vocational education programs. CRS 23-51-101
FLC Fort Lewis College	…a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards…shall offer selected undergraduate professional programs. CRS 23-52-102
MSC Mesa State College	…a general baccalaureate and specialized graduate institution with moderately selective admission standards…a limited number of professional, technical, and graduate programs…shall also maintain a community college role…including vocational and technical programs. CRS 23-53-101
USC University of Southern Colorado	…a general baccalaureate and polytechnic institution with moderately selective admission standards…professional and engineering technology programs, education programs, and traditional liberal arts and sciences…graduate programs compatible with its polytechnic mission…which uniquely serve southeastern Colorado. CRS 23-55-101
WSC Western State College	…a general baccalaureate institution with moderately selective admission standards…professional programs, educational programs, and traditional arts and sciences…no two-year programs. CRS 23-56-101
MSCD Metropolitan State College of Denver	…a comprehensive baccalaureate institution with modified open admission standards…nontraditional students…at least twenty years of age shall only have an admission requirement of a high school diploma, a GED…liberal arts and sciences, technical, and educational programs…professional programs…no graduate programs. CRS 23-54-101
ACC –Arapaho Community College CCA – Community College of Aurora CCD – Community College of Denver CNCC – Colorado Northwestern Community College FRCC – Front Range Community College	Each college shall be a two-year institution offering a broad range of general, personal, vocational, and technical education programs. No

LCC – Lamar Community College MCC – Morgan Community College NJC – Northeastern Junior College OJC – Otero Junior College PCC – Pueblo Community College PPCC – Pikes Peak Community College RRCC – Red Rocks Community College TSJC – Trinidad State Junior College	college shall impose admission requirements…educational programs to fill the occupational needs of youth and adults in technical and vocational fields…two-year transfer educational programs…personal and vocational education for adults. CRS 23-60-201
Aims – Aims Community College CMC – Colorado Mountain College	…not more than two years of training in the arts, sciences, and humanities beyond the twelfth grade…occupational, technical, and community service programs, with no term limitations, and general education, including college transfer programs, with unrestricted admissions. CRS 23-71-102

Each institution has its own particular role and mission and admission selectivity assigned to it by statute. Each has its own particular set of academic and student support programs. Taken as a whole, each institution has some aspect of uniqueness which cannot be adequately taken into account by any system designed to bring some uniformity and commonality. Whatever the quality indicator system that may involve, it must recognize and not compromise the diversity of institutions and their respective uniqueness. On the other hand, all institutions should be able to demonstrate good educational and administrative practices in offering their programs, allocating their resources, and being accountable to their students, taxpayers and the public. The quality indicator system for the future outlined in this report is believed to accomplish this important and necessary balance by honoring the diversity of Colorado's higher education institutions while promoting improvement in their operations.

This report presents quality indicators, institutional data, and applicable benchmarks without outlining new initiatives, remediation, or further inquiry that the data might suggest. HB 96-1219 provides for a follow-up report, due by January 30,2000, that will take that next step. The January report will describe the responsive actions taken or planned by the governing boards and institutions.

Nine Indicators for 1999, Institutional Data, and Benchmarks

Indicator 1A: Graduation Rates and Credits for Degree – four-year institutions.

Graduation Rates

Many students today do not enroll full time and thus do not progress through their college careers in the same time frame as students once did. Many students today choose to enroll in a number of courses during each semester that does not enable them to complete their chosen program in four years. Some of these students may also work while they are enrolled in college causing them to enroll in less than a full load of courses. This has led to the six-year graduation rate being the primary one that is reported nationally by educational organizations, publications (e.g., *US News and World Report*), and other states for comparative purposes.

The average percentage of entering, first-time, degree seeking freshmen in 1992 who graduated in six years from the same institution with a baccalaureate degree is calculated as a six-year graduation rate. The average percentage of entering, first-time, degree seeking freshmen in 1993 who graduated in five years from the same institution with a baccalaureate degree is calculated as a five-year graduation rate. The average percentage of entering, first-time, degree seeking freshmen in 1994 who graduated in four years from the same institution with a baccalaureate degree is calculated as a four-year graduation rate.

Caution when interpreting this indicator. This indicator tracks only entering, first-time, degree seeking freshmen. Any entering freshmen who might not be first-time or a degree seeking student is not included in the group of students considered by the indicator. For some institutions, especially urban institutions such as MSCD and CCD, a large percentage of their freshmen are not degree seeking. Many also are not first-time, having stopped-out during their higher education careers to attend to family responsibilities or to be employed for a period of time, only to return to resume their higher education careers.

Transfer students are also not included in the tracking of students for this indicator. If a student transfers to another institution prior to graduation, that student is no longer in the group of students of the initial institution and thus is included as a student who has not graduated from that same institution in either four, five or six years. The student may, however, have graduated from the institution to which he/she transferred. This student is successful and thus the higher education system has been successful, even though the graduation rate measure does not account for this success.

National benchmarks are being refined as additional data become available. With the additional data has come increased research related to refining the benchmarks to better measure expected as well as predicted performance. In particular, relationships between academic preparation of entering students and graduation rates are beginning to show correlation. As such research is better defined and benchmarks are refined, those benchmarks will be incorporated in the quality indicator system for this indicator.

6-YEAR GRADUATION RATE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	CSM	CSU	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	ASC	FLC	MSC	MSCD	USC	WSC
# of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen in Summer & Fall 1992	491	2,219	3,602	320	272	1,609	389	974	462	1,185	661	719
# of degrees	281	1,344	2,188	89	94	656	118	243	107	229	167	159
6-Year Grad Rate	57.2%	60.6%	60.7%	27.8%	34.6%	40.8%	30.3%	24.9%	23.2%	19.3%	25.3%	22.1%
Benchmark	67.3%	67.3%	67.3%	42.3%	42.3%	42.3%	35.3%	35.3%	35.3%	NA	35.3%	35.3%

NA = No benchmark was identified that would apply to MSCD given its modified open admission status.
Benchmarks are based on data for public institutions taken from: *The Retention and Graduation Rates of 1990-97 Entering Freshmen Cohorts in 269 US Colleges and Universities,* Center for Student Retention Data Exchange, University of Oklahoma, May 1999

5-YEAR GRADUATION RATE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	CSM	CSU	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	ASC	FLC	MSC	MSCD	USC	WSC
# of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen in Summer & Fall 1993	485	2,182	3,439	338	243	1,864	352	1,077	606	1,380	682	255
# of degrees	295	1,171	2,013	96	72	739	86	255	136	167	155	70
5-Year Grad Rate	60.8%	53.7%	58.5%	28.4%	29.6%	39.6%	24.4%	23.7%	22.4%	12.1%	22.7%	27.5%
Benchmark	61.3%	61.3%	61.3%	35.9%	35.9%	35.9%	27.9%	27.9%	27.9%	NA	27.9%	27.9%

NA = No benchmark was identified that would apply to MSCD given its modified open admission status.
Benchmarks are based on data for public institutions taken from: *The Retention and Graduation Rates of 1990-97 Entering Freshmen Cohorts in 269 US Colleges and Universities,* Center for Student Retention Data Exchange, University of Oklahoma, May 1999

4-YEAR GRADUATION RATE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	CSM	CSU	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	ASC	FLC	MSC	MSCD	USC	WSC
# of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen in Summer & Fall 1994	476	2,291	3,599	350	265	1,734	437	872	687	1,255	640	315
# of degrees	122	666	1,274	41	31	364	76	107	37	54	64	45
4-Year Grad Rate	25.6%	29.1%	35.4%	11.7%	11.7%	21.0%	17.4%	12.3%	5.4%	4.3%	10.0%	14.3%
Benchmark	36.7%	36.7%	36.7%	16.8%	16.8%	16.8%	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%	NA	11.2%	11.2%

NA = No benchmark was identified that would apply to MSCD given its modified open admission status
Benchmarks are based on data for public institutions taken from: *The Retention and Graduation Rates of 1990-97 Entering Freshmen Cohorts in 269 US Colleges and Universities,* Center for Student Retention Data Exchange, University of Oklahoma, May 1999

Credits for Degree Rate

The percentage of students who graduate having earned no more than 110% of the credits required for their particular baccalaureate degree is the credits for degree rate. Similar to the timelines for graduation rates, six, five, and four-year credits for degree rates are presented for the four-year institutions.

Students may accumulate more than 100% of the required credits for a variety of reasons. Some undertake a double major which involves more courses and credits. Others change their major late in their college careers and must enroll in a few more courses in their newly-selected major to complete requirements. Some may transfer to another institution resulting in retaking of a course or two due to different course equivalencies between the institutions.

The number of graduates included in the following Credits For Degree Rate tables may be less than the number of degrees listed in the prior Graduation Rate tables. For a few graduates (# of degrees), verification of the total number of required credits earned by the graduate could not be accomplished prior to the printing of this report.

SIX-YEAR CREDITS FOR DEGREE RATE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	CSM	CSU	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	ASC	FLC	MSC	MSCD	USC	WSC
# of grads of 1992 entering class of full-time, degree-seeking freshmen with at least 100% of required hours for the degree*	261	1,249	2,098	79	92	631	115	223	90	225	148	97
# of grads with < 111% of required hours for degree	223	841	1,504	62	60	383	63	160	47	159	101	57
%	85.4%	67.3%	71.7%	78.5%	65.2%	60.7%	54.8%	71.7%	52.2%	70.7%	68.2%	58.8%
Benchmark	74.8%	74.8%	74.8%	68.1%	68.1%	68.1%	62.7%	62.7%	62.7%	62.7%	62.7%	62.7%

Benchmark is the average of the "%" of the institutions comprising each admission tier category. MSCD is included in the moderately selective admission tier for this indicator.

* A few students may graduate with less than 100% of the required hours for the degrees listed on their transcripts due to credits being earned via testing, advanced placement, etc.

FIVE-YEAR CREDITS FOR DEGREE RATE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	CSM	CSU	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	ASC	FLC	MSC	MSCD	USC	WSC
# of grads of 1993 entering class of full-time, degree-seeking freshmen with at least 100% of required hours for the degree*	286	1,115	1,965	90	70	727	84	245	117	166	133	65
# of grads with < 111% of required hours for degree	237	798	1,454	76	54	447	55	177	69	120	96	49
%	82.9%	71.6%	74.0%	84.4%	77.1%	61.5%	65.5%	72.2%	59.0%	72.3%	72.2%	75.4%
Benchmark	76.1%	76.1%	76.1%	74.3%	74.3%	74.3%	69.4%	69.4%	69.4%	69.4%	69.4%	69.4%

Benchmark is the average of "%" of the institutions comprising each admission tier. MSCD is included in the moderately selective admission tier for this indicator.

* A few students may graduate with less than 100% of the required hours for the degrees listed on their transcripts due to credits being earned via testing, advanced placement, etc.

FOUR-YEAR CREDITS FOR DEGREE RATE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	CSM	CSU	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	ASC	FLC	MSC	MSCD	USC	WSC
# of grads of 1994 entering class of full-time, degree-seeking freshmen with at least 100% of required hours for the degree*	120	638	1,243	38	30	361	75	104	42	51	57	45
# of grads with < 111% of required hours for degree	110	527	1,073	37	26	305	63	90	33	45	49	41
%	91.7%	82.6%	86.3%	97.4%	86.7%	84.5%	84.0%	86.5%	78.6%	88.2%	86.0%	91.1%
Benchmark	86.9%	86.9%	86.9%	89.5%	89.5%	89.5%	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%

Benchmarks are the average of "%" of the institutions comprising each admission tier. MSCD is included in the moderately selective admission tier for this indicator.

* A few students may graduate with less than 100% of the required hours for the degrees listed on their transcripts due to credits being earned via testing, advanced placement, etc.

Indicator 1B: Graduation Rates for Two-Year Institutions

A similar definition applies to this indicator as to Indictor 1A. This indicator measures three and two-year graduation rates for entering, first-time, certificate or degree seeking freshmen in two-year institutions.

Caution when interpreting this indicator. Similar cautions apply to this indicator as applied to Indicator 1A. In addition, the benchmarks for the graduation rates do not differentiate between urban/suburban and rural two-year institutions. Similar to the situation with the four-year institution MSCD, urban/suburban two-year institutions enroll large numbers of non-traditional and part-time students. Many students in urban/suburban two-year institutions also "stop-in and stop-out" for periods of time due to family or employment responsibilities. Completing their program in two or three years is not necessarily a priority for these students. Consequently, one should expect the graduation rates for urban/suburban two-year institutions to be less than the rates for the rural two-year institutions.

THREE-YEAR GRADUATION RATE FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	# of first-time, full-time, degree or certificate-seeking freshmen in Summer of Fall 1995	# of degrees or certificates	3-year graduation rate	Benchmark
ACC	442	101	22.9%	26.5%
Aims	397	95	23.9%	26.5%
CCA	297	31	10.4%	26.5%
CCD	476	59	12.4%	26.5%
CMC	477	124	26.0%	26.5%
CNCC	141	31	22.0%	26.5%
FRCC	943	160	17.0%	26.5%
LCC	199	57	28.6%	26.5%
MCC	129	82	63.6%	26.5%
NJC	413	184	44.6%	26.5%
OJC	245	90	36.7%	26.5%
PCC	404	83	20.5%	26.5%
PPCC	855	94	11.0%	26.5%

RRCC	516	89	17.2%	26.5%
TSJC	394	162	41.1%	26.5%

Benchmark is the average of the 3-year graduation rate of all the institutions.

TWO-YEAR GRADUATION RATE FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	# of first-time, full-time, degree or certificate-seeking freshmen in Summer or Fall of 1996	# of degrees or certificates	2-year graduation rate	Benchmark
ACC	485	91	18.8%	18.0%
Aims	493	50	10.1%	18.0%
CCA	236	11	4.7%	18.0%
CCD	485	52	10.7%	18.0%
CMC	402	34	8.5%	18.0%
CNCC	156	25	16.0%	18.0%
FRCC	835	63	7.5%	18.0%
LCC	155	28	18.1%	18.0%
MCC	90	44	48.9%	18.0%
NJC	475	173	36.4%	18.0%
OJC	215	54	25.1%	18.0%
PCC	335	30	10.0%	18.0%
PPCC	849	44	9.0%	18.0%
RRCC	498	56	11.2%	18.0%
TSJC	335	131	39.1%	18.0%

Benchmark is the average of the 2-year graduation rate for all the institutions.

Indicator 2: Faculty Instructional Productivity

The percentage of a 40-hour week that full-time faculty paid from state-appropriated funds devote to teaching related activity is calculated. Teaching related activity is defined to include all instructional activities – direct contact with students via teaching in classrooms, laboratories and field sites, teaching preparation, advising of students, grading papers and tests, e-mail interaction with students, office hours, etc. The measure is limited to full-time faculty. The measure does not include faculty paid from other funds. Full-time faculty in four-year institutions are classified according to whether the faculty member is tenured, on a tenure-track appointment, or is neither tenured or on a tenure-track appointment (other).

FACULTY INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

Institution	Ave. # of Weekly Teaching Contact Hours per Tenured Faculty FTE	Ave. # of Weekly Teaching Contact Hours per Tenure-Track Faculty FTE	Ave. # of Weekly Teaching Contact Hours per Other Full-Time Faculty FTE	Overall Ave. # of Weekly Teaching Contact Hours per Full-Time Faculty FTE	Adjustment Factor from National Study for Converting Teaching Contact Hours to Teaching Related Hours	Total Weekly Teaching Related Hours	% of 40-Hour Work Week	National Benchmark
CSM	8.7	7.6	12.5	9.3	3.3	30.7	77%	57%
CSU	7.6	7.3	11.5	8.0	3.3	26.4	66%	57%

UCB	5.3	5.8	13.0	6.4	3.3	21.1	53%	57%
UCD	7.9	10.0	12.6	9.2	2.7	24.8	62%	65%
UCCS	13.3	12.9	19.8	14.6	2.7	39.4	99%	65%
UNC	10.9	10.6	17.2	12.1	2.7	32.7	82%	65%
ASC	12.1	18.1	14.5	14.6	2.9	42.3	106%	79%
FLC	13.6	12.8	20.3	13.6	2.9	39.4	99%	79%
MSC	18.0	14.7	17.2	16.7	2.9	48.4	121%	79%
MSCD	13.1	13.6	14.4	13.4	2.9	38.9	97%	79%
USC	10.9	11.7	14.4	11.4	2.9	33.1	83%	79%
WSC	12.1	12.4	---------	12.2	2.9	35.4	89%	79%
ACC				18.5	2.0	37.0	93%	81%
Aims				23.7	2.0	39.4	99%	81%
CCA				14.2	2.0	28.4	71%	81%
CCD				13.5	2.0	27.0	68%	81%
CMC				18.5	2.0	37.0	93%	81%
CNCC				15.1	2.0	30.2	76%	81%
FRCC				19.7	2.0	39.4	99%	81%
LCC				22.9	2.0	45.8	115%	81%
MCC				17.2	2.0	34.4	86%	81%
NJC				23.1	2.0	46.2	116%	81%
OJC				18.6	2.0	37.2	93%	81%
PCC				18.0	2.0	36.0	90%	81%
PPCC				19.6	2.0	39.2	98%	81%
RRCC				14.9	2.0	29.8	75%	81%
TSJC				12.9	2.0	25.8	65%	81%

Benchmarks are taken from the *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty*, National Center for Higher Education Statistics, US Department of Education, July 1997. These benchmarks will be updated when the results of the 1998-99 study are released.

Indicator 3: Freshmen Persistence

Research has shown that the most probably time for students to dropout of higher education is during or at the end of the freshman year. Thus, retention and persistence of freshmen into their sophomore year is given high priority by institutions in terms of student support and intervention activity.

Persistence measures student success in continuing his/her educational career regardless of the institution the student is attending. Persistence recognizes the contribution made by each institution in the continuing success of the student. Retention, on the other hand, is a more limited measure of persistence. It confines persistence to only the institution originally attended by the student.

The percentage of Fall 1997 entering, first-time, certificate or degree seeking freshmen who either completed a certificate program by June 1998, were enrolled in the Fall 1998 semester at the same institution, or transferred to another Colorado public institution where they were enrolled in the Fall 1998 semester is calculated as the freshmen persistence rate.

Caution when interpreting this indicator: Students who transfer to a private institution in Colorado or to any institution not located in the state of Colorado are not counted as persisting in this indicator.

FRESHMEN PERSISTENCE FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	(1) # of full-time, degree-seeking freshmen students entering in summer or fall of 1997	(2) # retained in the same institution in fall 1998	(3) # retained in any Colorado public institution of higher education in fall 1998	(4) % persisted in Colorado public higher education (3) / (1)	Benchmark
CSM	472	405	423	89.6%	88.2%
CSU	2,615	2,145	2,288	87.5%	88.2%
UCB	4,224	3,558	3,637	86.1%	88.2%
UCCS	551	342	404	73.3%	78.9%
UCD	433	316	358	82.7%	78.9%
UNC	1,908	1,274	1,538	80.6%	78.9%
ASC	418	223	281	67.2%	69.4%
FLC	1,058	541	693	65.5%	69.4%
MSC	701	441	518	73.9%	69.4%
MSCD	1,480	872	1,027	69.4%	69.4%
USC	558	346	405	72.6%	69.4%
WSC	561	289	379	67.6%	69.4%

Benchmarks are average of the "% persisted in Colorado public higher education" for the institutions comprising the various admission tiers. MSCD is included in the moderately selective admission tier for this indicator.

FRESHMEN PERSISTENCE FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	(1) # of full-time, degree-or certificate-seeking freshmen entering in summer or fall of 19 97	(2) # retained in the same institution in fall 1998	(3) # retained in any Colorado public institution of higher education in fall 1998	(4) % persisted in Colorado public higher education (3) / (1)	Benchmark
ACC	390	180	266	68.2%	58.4%
Aims	460	205	270	58.7%	58.4%
CCA	234	90	108	46.2%	58.4%
CCD	494	225	281	56.9%	58.4%
CMC	526	236	306	58.2%	58.4%
CNCC	170	74	94	55.3%	58.4%
FRCC	953	422	587	61.6%	58.4%
LCC	182	90	104	57.1%	58.4%
MCC	79	32	44	55.7%	58.4%
NJC	348	200	246	70.7%	58.4%
OJC	239	119	143	59.8%	58.4%
PCC	323	151	181	56.0%	58.4%
PPCC	796	332	401	50.4%	58.4%
RRCC	544	228	311	57.2%	58.4%
TSJC	297	117	191	64.3%	58.4%

Benchmark is the average of the "% persisted in Colorado public higher education" for all the institutions

Indicator 4: Achievement Rates

How well institutions have prepared their students is captured, in part, by how well graduating students perform on various comprehensive examinations, tests, and discipline or professional-specific licensure examinations. The percentages of students or graduates taking various licensure, professional association, major field, or graduate school admission tests or examinations for the first time who passed are reported as achievement rates. Mean scores and/or passing rates on Colorado's PLACE test (four-year institutions with teacher preparation programs), Graduate Record Examination (four-year institutions with a least 20 students taken the examination), Uniform CPA Examination (four-year institutions with accounting programs), Registered Nurse Licensure Examination (institutions with registered nursing programs), Practical Nurse Licensure Examination (two-year institutions with practical nursing programs), Radiologic Technology Examination (five institutions with radiology technology programs), Fundamentals of Engineering Examination (three institutions with engineering programs), and various tests/examinations utilized by at least one institution are used for this indicator.

Percentage Passing the PLACE Examination (Teacher Preparation)

PLACE Exam Section	ASC	CSU	FLC	MSC	MSCD	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	USC	WSC
# of takers	54	508	102	413	1,665	244	87	122	549	102	53
Liberal Arts	69%	93%	68%	85%	87%	95%	98%	95%	78%	57%	55%
Benchmark	81%	85%	80%	85%	85%	80%	85%	80%	80%	80%	80%
# of takers	21	NA	76	205	901	136	50	92	277	68	31
Elementary	86%	NA	88%	94%	86%	97%	100%	91%	87%	79%	74%
Benchmark	88%		87%	86%	86%	87%	86%	87%	87%	87%	87%
# of takers	20	419	45	130	550	147	36	35	132	42	23
Secondary	90%	91%	89%	94%	91%	98%	94%	97%	84%	79%	91%
Benchmark	89%	87%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	89%	90%	90%

NA = CSU does not offer an elementary licensure program.
Benchmarks are the statewide passing rates for all takers of the PLACE for the various administrations of the test that the particular institution reported.

Mean Scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE)

GRE Category	ASC	CSM	CSU	FLC	MSC	MSCD	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	USC	WSC
# of takers	36	41	272	67	136	295	227	29	57	68	30	27
Verbal	454	487	472	487	466	485	509	495	467	425	436	495
Benchmark	478	478	478	478	478	478	478	478	478	478	478	478
# of takers	36	41	272	67	136	295	227	29	57	68	30	27
Quantitative	511	695	574	540	520	500	599	512	531	491	485	519
Benchmark	562	562	562	562	562	562	562	562	562	562	562	562
# of takers	36	41	272	67	136	295	227	29	57	68	30	27
Analytical	531	619	584	550	544	533	597	557	552	526	480	532

Benchmark	565	565	565	565	565	565	565	565	565	565	565	565

Benchmarks are the national mean scores on the Graduate Record Examination.

Uniform CPA Examination

	ASC	CSU	FLC	MSC	MSCD	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	USC	WSC
# of first-time test takers	15	29	15	15	61	40	15	42	31	0	15
% Passing	8.7%	13.8%	13.3%	26.7%	13.1%	27.5%	20.0%	9.5%	12.9%	NA	13.3%
Benchmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
# of first-time plus reexamination takers	42	125	54	37	170	143	31	108	72	20	33
% Passing	28.2%	25.6%	18.7%	32.5%	20.6%	33.6%	45.2%	13.9%	23.6%	15.0%	36.4%
Benchmark	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%	24.5%

Benchmark is the Colorado passing rate for first-time and reexamination test takers without advanced degrees.

Registered Nursing Licensure Examination

Institution	ACC	CCD	CMC	FRCC	MCC	MSC	OJC	PCC	PPCC	TSJC	UCCS	UCHSC	UNC	USC
# of first-time test takers	68	54	15	123	13	33	23	38	58	21	60	101	42	27
# passing	51	46	14	111	11	31	20	30	49	18	58	90	36	23
% passing	75%	85%	93%	90%	85%	94%	87%	79%	85%	86%	97%	89%	86%	85%
Benchmark	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%

Benchmark is Colorado's passing rate on the Registered Nurse Licensure Examination for the period 10/1/98 through 9/30/99.

Practical Nurse Licensure Examination – Two-Year Institutions

Institution	CCD	CMC	CNCC	FRCC	LCC	OJC	PCC	PPCC	TSJC
# of first-time test takers	18	16	15	114	11	14	59	29	20
# passing	17	16	13	105	8	14	58	28	18
% passing	94%	100%	87%	92%	73%	100%	98%	97%	90%
Benchmark	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%

Benchmark is Colorado's passing rate on the Practical Nurse Licensure Examination for the period 10/1/98 through 9/30/99

Radiologic Technology Examination

Institution	Aims	CCD	MSC	PCC	RRCC
# of first-time test takers	18	14	10	14	8
# passing	17	14	9	8	6
% passing	94%	100%	90%	57%	75%

Fundamentals of Engineering Examination

	CSM	CSU	UCB
Percentage Pass Rate	94%	92%	85%
National Benchmark	70%	70%	70%

Various Examinations and Tests Taken by Students
From at Least One Four-Year Institution

EXAMINATION	UCB	NATIONAL BENCHMARK	UCHSC	NATIONAL BECHMARK
Law School Admission Test	155	150		
Colorado Bar Exam	97%	82%		
Graduate Management Admissions	550	520		
Medical College Admissions				
--Verbal	8.6	7.9		
--Physical Sciences	8.8	8.1		
--Biological Sciences	9.2	8.4		
National Pharmacy Licensing			91%	91%
Physical Therapist Licensing			97%	88%
National Board of Dental Hyg.			100%	91%
Physician Asst. National Cert.			100%	74%
US Medical Licensing			100%	95%

EXAMINATION	CSU	NATIONAL BENCHMARK
Occupational Therapy	96%	94%
Music Therapy	96%	80%

Indicator 5: Lower Division Class Size

Research has shown that smaller class size has a positive impact on learning in K-12 education. A similar assumption extends to higher education, especially in the initial phases of college participation when the student's transition into the collegiate environment is most pronounced and the probability of being unsuccessful is highest. Integrated with comprehensive advising and counseling, appropriate intervention techniques, and extensive student support systems, the provision of small classes during the first few semesters of the collegiate experience is viewed as one means for combating the attrition of freshmen.

Small average class size is one of several measures related to the likelihood of freshmen or sophomore students having one or more small class experiences. This was the measure chosen for this indicator. Another measure is the percentage of lower division classes with 30 or fewer students. It too is displayed in the following tables.

AVERAGE HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT IN LOWER DIVISION CLASSES AND THE PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES WITH FEWER THAN 31 STUDENTS
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	ASC	CSM	CSU	FLC	MSC	MSCD	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UNC	USC	WSC
% of lower division classes with < 31 students	71%	68%	59%	73%	74%	75%	74%	59%	69%	60%	64%	69%
Average Class Size	25	29	41	26	24	25	38	33	29	36	29	26
Benchmark	30	35	35	30	30	30	35	33	33	33	30	30

Benchmarks were established by CCHE. Alternative measures for this indicator are being considered which would lend themselves to national benchmarks.

TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Institution	ACC	Aims	CCA	CCD	CMC	CNCC	FRCC	LCC	MCC	NJC	OJC	PCC	PPCC	RRCC	TSJC
% of lower division classes with < 31 students	94%	97%	99%	95%	99%	89%	93%	96%	98%	97%	96%	98%	99%	94%	99%
Average Class Size	16	12	14	14	12	15	16	11	9	18	14	12	14	14	9
Benchmark	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Benchmark were established by CCHE. Alternative measures are being considered for this indicator which lend themselves to national benchmarks.

Indicator 6: Approved and Implemented Diversity Plan

Each institution was directed by the CCHE to develop a plan for enhancing diversity at the institution. That plan, if approved by the governing board and accompanied by a statement from the governing board that the resources inherent in the plan have been committed to accomplishing the plan, constitutes this indicator.

APPROVED AND IMPLEMENTED PLAN?

ASC	CSM	CSU	FLC	MSC	MSCD	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UCHSC	UNC	USC	WSC
YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

ACC	Aims	CCA	CCD	CMC	CNCC	FRCC	LCC	MCC	NEJC	OJC	PCC	PPCC	RRCC	TSJC
YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Indicator 7: Institutional Support Costs

Each institution's operating budget is categorized in accordance with specific reporting requirements. One such category is "institutional support". This category most closely encompasses what is considered "administration". The percentage that institutional

support is of the total Educational and General budget of the institution provides a measure of the administrative efficiency of the institution.

Caution when interpreting this indicator. The budget categories specified for the reporting of expenditures allow for differing assignment of functions depending on the organization structure of the institution. Consequently, some expenditures may be included in "institutional support" by one institution and not by another. Both institutions are correct in their assignment of similar expenditures to different budget categories since the function is organizationally housed in different areas and thus can legitimately be reported in two different categories.

An example is computing services. If an institution has separated its computing services into academic computing and administrative computing, only administrative computing will be accounted for in institutional support. Academic computing will be accounted for in another category of the budget. If another institution has not separated its computing services, it will report all expenditures for computing services in institutional support.

Other factors can influence the percentage of an institution's budget that is devoted to administration (institutional support). Certain administrative costs are fixed regardless of the size of the institution, its role & mission, its admission status, etc. If the overall general fund appropriation to the institution is significantly less than another institution of comparable role & mission, admission status, size, etc., then the percentage of the total Education and General Budget that is institutional support will be greater for the institution by virtue of its smaller general fund allocation.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTION'S TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL FUND BUDGETS

FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
(average of three years of data)

Institution	ASC	CSM	CSU	FLC	MSC	MSCD	UCB	UCCS	UCD	UCHSC	UNC	USC	WSC
1998 -99 FTE	2,266	3,251	19,863	3,998	4,189	12,317	22,445	4,980	7,229	2,436	10,280	3,600	2,198
1998-99 General Fund (millions)	$9.5	$17.5	$77.4	$9.6	$14.1	$39.0	$73.9	$18.2'	$29.5	$67.3	$37.2	$14.5	$6.0
Institutional Support as % of Total E&G Budget	14.6%	14.5%	8.7%	12.9%	9.9%	14.8%	8.7%	10.9%	9.8%	12.5%	10.9%	9.6%	14.1%
Benchmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
(average of three years of data)

Inst.	ACC	Aims	CCA	CCD	CMC	CNCC	FRCC	LCC	MCC	NEJC	OJC	PCC	PPCC	RRCC	TSJC
98-99 FTE	4,280	3,830	2,580	4,100	3,078	795	7,009	746	927	1,579	906	3,220	5,420	4,399	1,470
98-99 Gen Fund (millions)	$8.3	$4.8	$6.3	$12.0	$5.2	$1.6	$13.4	$3.0	$3.3	$5.8	$3.8	$9.9	$13.7	$9.3	$5.7
Institutional Support as % of Total E&G Budget															

	12.8	13.9	14.5	12.2	19.3	22.8	12.7	18.8	15.4	18.2	12.5	14.4	15.7	12.1	12
Benchmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

NA = No national or peer institution benchmark was identified. It is anticipated that a benchmark will be identified for use in the future.

Indicators 8 and 9: These indicators are institutional-specific indicators. The variety of indicators identified by the institutions and approved by the respective governing board is representative of the diversity of Colorado public higher education. Benchmarks for each indicator are identified.

INDICATORS IDENTIFIED BY INSTITUTIONS AND APPROVED BY THE RESPECTIVE GOVERNING BOARD

INST	INDICATOR 8	BENCHMARK FOR 8	INDICATOR 9	BENCHMARK FOR 9
ASC	Progress In Providing Educational Access: a. Student tuition & fees b. Access to educational courses	a. Remain below the state median of the four-year Colorado public institutions in 1998-99 tuition & fees. bi Increase from 1997-98 to 1998-99 in access to courses offered at off-campus sites and at non- traditional times.	Adams State Student Satisfaction	80% of respondents to a 1999 survey of 1997-98 alumni will indicate satisfaction or better to question: "Overall, did your instructional program meet your educational goals."
Aims	Articulation, collaboration, and partnerships with external entities.	% of existing articulation, collaboration, and partnership agreements of total possible.	Staff and professional development programs.	Percentage of budgeted funds for professional development of total operating funds.
ACC	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	# of businesses and clients served through specialized business and industry training.	178 businesses served and 3,250 students involved.
CNCC	% of course sections offered at nontraditional times, % of course section offered in nontraditional formats, and % of course sections in off-campus locations other than state owned facilities.	81% of course sections.	% of Career and Technical Education graduates placed in related fields or continuing their education	84% of graduates.
CCA	# of businesses and clients served through specialized business and industry training.	178 businesses served and 3,250 students involved.	% of minority students v. availability in service area.	Ratio of 1.
CCD	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	% of successful students (graduation and transfer) of color compared to % of adult service area who are people of color.	Ratio of 1 for each category.
CMC	Participation rate	150% of the statewide community college average participation rate	Developmental Studies	110% of the state average.
CSM	Employment of Recent Graduates in Field	i) 85% less unemployment at six months ii) 95% less unemployment at eighteen months.	Starting Salaries of Recent Graduates	Average starting salaries compared to national or state averages.
CSU	Percentage increase in federally funded research awards.	Meet or exceed the overall percentage increase in federal funding for research.	Rating of Professional Veterinary Medicine program	Score in the top 25% of all 31 schools rated by the AAVMC.

				Score in the top 25% in 90% or more of the categories comprising the AAVMC's annual Comparative Data Report.
FLC	Percent of students who transfer from their initial institution and graduate within the Colorado system.	Score in the top 25% of all Colorado four-year public Institutions.	Average length of time for students to graduate.	Faster than 75% of the other four-year institutions in Colorado.
FRCC	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	% of course sections offered at nontraditional times and % of courses sections offered in nontraditional formats.	64% of courses.
LCC	% of Career and Technical Education graduates employed or continuing their education.	95% of graduates.	% of course sections offered at nontraditional times, % of course sections offered in nontraditional formats, and % of course sections in off-campus locations other than state owned facilities.	81% of courses.
MSC	Progress in providing educational access: a. Student tuition & fees b. Access to educational courses	a. Remain below the state median of the four-year Colorado public institutions in 1998-99 tuition & fees. bi. Increase from 1997-98 to 1998-99 in access to courses offered at off-campus sites and at non-traditional times.	Progress in providing students co-curricular activities linked to the classroom.	33% of the 1998-99 graduates will have participated in various co-curricular activities linked to the classroom.
MSCD	Progress in providing educational access: a. Student tuition & fees b. Access to educational courses	a. Remain below the state Median of the four-year Colorado public institutions In 1998-99 tuition & fees. bi. Increase from 1997-98 to 1998-99 in access to courses with alternative delivery components.	Student participation in active learning workplace experiences.	33% of the 1998-99 graduates will have participated in an active learning workplace experience.
MCC	% of Career and Technical Education graduates employed or continuing their education.	95% of students.	% of minority students compared to availability in service area.	Ratio of 1.
NJC	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	Service area participation rates.	Ratio of 2.7.
OJC	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	% of Career and Technical Education graduates placed in related fields or	84% of graduates.

			continuing education.	
PPCC	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	% of course sections offered at nontraditional times and % of course sections offered in nontraditional formats.	64 percent of courses.
PCC	% of course sections offered at nontraditional times and % of course sections offered in nontraditional formats.	64 percent of courses.	% of minority students compared to availability in service area.	Ratio of 1.
RRCC	% of students expressing satisfaction with instruction.	90% of surveyed students.	% of course sections offered at nontraditional times and % of course sections offered in nontraditional formats.	64 percent of courses.
TSJC	% of minority students v. availability in service area; minority faculty, executive, and other professional staff v. statewide availability; minority clerical, technical, skilled craft and maintenance staff v. service area availability.	1 percent for each category.	Service area participation rate.	Ratio of 2.7.
UCB	Percent participating in special academic opportunities, of calendar year 1998 bachelors' degree recipients who entered as full-time freshmen.	62% of entering full-time freshmen graduates will have participated.	Federal science and engineering research and development expenditures per tenured and tenure-track faculty member, fiscal year 1997-98.	Top 5 public research universities in the United States.
UCCS	Continue to attract students of high academic quality entering CU-Colorado Springs.	a) Higher average admission index for Fall 1999 than Fall 1998. b) Utilize only 5% of the available 20% admission window. c) Fall 1999 resident enrollment exceeds 1998. d) Fall 1999 minority enrollment greater than Fall 1998.	Offer cutting-edge, high quality professional programs tailored to serving the business, industry, government, education, and health care sectors within the greater Pikes Peak region.	81% of professional programs are accredited.
UCD	Provide undergraduate and graduate students with a quality education that meets their professional and personal educational goals: a) Percent of employed bachelor's and graduate degree recipients one	a) Exceed national average. b) Meet or exceed the admission tier group average.	The quality and growth of community and K-12 partnerships: a) Percent of faculty engaged in partnerships with businesses, industry, and schools. b) Faculty hours in K-12 setting	a) Maintain or improve Percent of faculty Engaged in Partnerships. b) Meet or exceed the average of the admission tier institutions. c) Increase in most recent academic year in number of

	year after graduation with job related to degree. b) Percent of degree recipients indicating that program of study met their educational goals.		c) Increased higher education opportunities for high school students.	high school students participating in higher education opportunities.
UCHSC	Growth in external funding of research relative to growth in Colorado CPI.	Average growth will exceed the average increase in Colorado's CPI over the most recent five-year period.	Employment of 1998 UCHSC graduates in positions where their UCHSC training is utilized.	Unemployment rate of graduates will be lower than the average unemployment rate for Colorado during the fiscal year following graduation.
UNC	After graduation performance	95% or more of undergraduate student degree completers are either employed or engaged in further study one year after graduation.	Student evaluation of instructional quality	Overall score on the 199 Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory Survey will exceed the national average score.
USC	Percentage of undergraduate degrees awarded to minority students at USC.	At least 150% of the percentage of undergraduate degrees awarded to minority students Statewide.	Number of publicly available computer workstations per fall headcount students	Shall meet or exceed the national average for four-year public institutions.
WSC	Progress in providing educational access: a. Student tuition & fees b. Access to educational courses.	a. Remain below the state median of four-year Colorado public institutions in 1998-99 tuition and fees. bi. Increase from 1997-98 to 1998-99 in access to courses with alternative delivery components.	Improved student experience.	Scores from 1998-99 on a nationally standardized Survey of student satisfaction will be above the norm for the cohort of other public colleges using the survey.

QUALITY INDICATOR SYSTEM FOR THE FUTURE

In implementing SB 99-229, the Commission established a quality indicator system which is being implemented in January 2000. It will serve as the quality indicator system for the future. A report of its implementation will be made in December 2000.

This quality indicator system incorporates twenty-nine measures of institutional performance. The majority of these measures include benchmarks for comparing

improvement and achievement. Benchmarks for the remaining measures are in the process of being established.

It is important to note that the quality indicator system is a work in progress. Continual refinement is required to keep the system relevant and to benefit from experience, both within Colorado and that learned from other states. The experiences of other states show that quality indicator/performance measurement systems must be dynamic. Refinement will be necessary as changing circumstances necessitate changes in the system. Experience with the system will lead to refinement. It is anticipated that certain measures and benchmarks will be abandoned while others are introduced during the course of the next few years. The General Assembly in HB 96-1219 recognized the ongoing need for change and refinement in the original language establishing the expectations for a quality indicator system:

"...When reviewing the revising the statewide quality indicators, the commission shall modify the indicators as necessary..." (23-13-105 (2)(a) CRS.

QUALITY INDICATOR SYSTEM FOR THE FUTURE

Indicators and Performance Measures

IA: For every thirty headcount fall census freshman students, one section of each general education lower division core course required of all freshmen will be offered during the academic year. Any section enrolling fewer than ten headcount students may be subject to cancellation due to low enrollment.

IB: Throughout the class "day", required and core courses will be offered so that the percentage of students not accommodated to the number of students offered a place in a course section is less than 10%.

ID: Institutions will provide Undergraduate students, via the WWW and/or publications, internal transfer guides listing transferable courses by degree program. At least once every three years, students will be surveyed regarding the effectiveness of the institution's efforts. The Quality Indicator System Advisory Committee will work to develop some questions for the survey that can be used by all institutions. The results of the survey will be given to the governing board and the CCHE.

IIA: Governing board program review processes and the CCHE's approval process for new degree programs will include analysis and evaluation of curriculum and potential employer input.

IIC: Improving the retention of students, especially freshmen students, is a goal which can be impacted by providing classes with enrollment conducive to improved student learning. Depending on institutional role and mission and enrollment size, this goal will be pursued through a combination of: (1) having the average headcount enrollment in all lower division class sections will be less than 30 for four-year institutions and less than 18 for two-year institutions, (2) enhancing the academic clustering of lower division courses and freshmen students, (3) having the percentage of class sections with less than 20 students exceed national benchmarks, and (4) having the percentage of class sections with more than 50 students be less than national benchmarks. Items (3) and (4) will be used for performance measurement purposes for four-year institutions and item (1) for two-year institutions.

III: Each institution will Implement and maintain a student advising system utilizing the Academic Advising Policy of the Colorado Student Association as a guideline. At least every three years, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the advising system will be conducted by the institution with involvement of the institution's student body organization. The results of the evaluation will be shared with the respective governing board and the CCHE.

IVA: Full-time faculty paid from state appropriated funds will devote to teaching related activities at least: (1) "w" hours per week for community college faculty; (2) "x" hours per week for state college, Ft. Lewis, and USC faculty; (3) "y" hours per week for UCCS, UCD, and UNC faculty, and (4) "z" hours per week for CSM, CSU, and UCB faculty. The values "w", "x", "y", and "z" will be established based on: (1) an analysis of the data obtained from the performance measures used during FY 1999-2000 and the data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparisons with actual data for institutions with similar roles and missions, and (3) comparisons with benchmarks established by other states for institutions with similar roles and missions.

IVB: A substantial portion of any institutional decision related to renewal of employment or adjustment in salary associated with the portion of a faculty member's assignment at the undergraduate level shall be based upon the results of an evaluation of the quality of teaching and, if applicable, also advising.

IVC: For the portion of a faculty member's assignment at the undergraduate level, an annual evaluation of the quality of teaching shall be conducted with the evaluation including, at a minimum, a component incorporating an evaluation of teaching effectiveness by students.

V: Continuing faculty and staff members with evaluation results that are substandard (as defined by the respective institution's evaluation process), shall be required to attend and complete, within one year of the evaluation, a professional development experience focused on enhancing teaching, advising, and/or mentoring skills and methods.

VI: In addition to its own description of the skills and abilities that freshmen must have to be successful at the institution, each institution will include in its WWW- based undergraduate admission materials a copy of Ready and Able. At least every three years, a survey of freshmen during the second semester of their freshman year will be conducted which includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of the institution in communicating expectations for incoming freshmen. The Quality Indicator System Advisory Committee will develop some common survey questions for use in the survey.

VIIA: Each institution shall make the awarding of Governor's Opportunity Scholarships (GOS) to economically disadvantaged students and students from traditionally underrepresented groups a high priority of its financial aid program as evidenced by the initial number of GOS recipients and annual growth of students served by GOS.

VIIB: Each institution, either individually, as part of a group of institutions, as a member of a consortium of institutions and agencies, or in cooperation with the private sector, shall provide or participate in pre-college programs focused on the particular needs associated with the enrollment, retention, and graduation of economically disadvantaged students and students from traditionally underrepresented groups.

VIII: Consistent with the Postsecondary Options Act and in cooperation with secondary public schools that express an interest and willingness to accommodate the offering of courses utilizing their facilities or technology, institutions shall offer college credit courses that enroll secondary students, recognizing that minimal class enrollments may cause courses to be cancelled.

IX: Institutions with graduate programs in education shall work cooperatively with educators and principals to design and implement professional development programs that meet the needs of the educators and principals. [NA for institutions w/o these programs]

XIA: Consistent with role and mission, "x"% of the undergraduate students and graduates in their first year following graduation taking various licensure, graduate school admission, major field, professional association, vocational, and occupational tests and examinations for the first time will pass or achieve a score or percentage rate at least equal to the national norm for students in similar institutions. "x" will be established based on: (1) an analysis of the data obtained from the performance measures used during FY 1999-2000 and the data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparisons with actual data for institutions with similar roles and missions, and (3) comparisons established by other states for institutions with similar roles and mission.

XIB: By November 1,2000, governing boards will submit to CCHE for its approval a plan for each institution governed by the board that describes a graduation year assessment program required of students prior to graduation. The program outlined by the plan shall measure the student's knowledge in his/her major field, vocational, or training area. The program, at a minimum, shall include the use of nationally normed major field tests (e.g., ETS), if available and applicable. In addition, the program may include, but not be limited to, the use of portfolios of accomplishment and/or demonstrations of competency. Particular attention should be paid to incorporating the accreditation standards being

promulgated by the North Central Association for outcomes and competency assessment. The program shall be piloted with spring and summer 2001 graduates with full implementation thereafter. Sampling and a spreading of the number of degree programs over several years may be considered as part of full implementation. The results of the institution's Assessment program will be shared annually with the governing board and CCHE beginning with AY 2002-03.

XIC: Beginning with pilot projects in AY 2000-01 at institutions choosing to participate in piloting various nationally normed standardized tests (e.g., ETS Academic Profile, ARC College BASE, ACT CAAP test), all institutions will implement no later than spring 2002 as a requirement for a student to achieve junior status, an assessment of competency in foundational skills and basic literacy which comprise general education curricula (e.g., reading, writing, quantitative, critical thinking). The assessment will utilize a nationally normed standardized test. At the discretion of the institution and governing board, other assessment tools may be part of the assessment and the results submitted to CCHE. The mean score of the institution's students will be compared to the national mean score and both scores reported to the governing board and CCHE. To the extent possible, the data will be analyzed and reported for native and transfer students separately.

XII: Each institution will include, in its annual report related to the Quality Indicator System, a listing of the cooperative education, internship, and service learning opportunities made available by the institution to students.

XIII: Responses from surveys of employers of recent graduates of the institution will be analyzed to determine an appropriate benchmark for measuring employer satisfaction. Common components for all surveys utilized by institutions beginning in FY 2001-02 will be developed by a Task Force established by the CCHE for this purpose. Surveys should be administered at least once every three years.

XIV: As appropriate to the institution's role and mission, work force training programs and research devoted to economic development, as identified by local/regional chambers of commerce and economic development councils through needs assessment, will be developed by institutions.

XV: By means such as integrating technology in the administrative functions of the institution, annual expenditures for institutional support (excluding ICR and all "charge backs" to institutions of governing board and central administration expenditures costs) will be less than or equal to benchmarks for similar types of institutions. The benchmarks will be established based on: (1) an analysis of the data obtained from the performance measures used during FY 1999-2000 and the data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparisons with actual data for institutions with similar roles and missions, (3) comparisons with benchmarks established by other states for institutions with similar roles and missions. Institutions with several campuses in geographical separate areas may be expected to exceed the benchmark percentage (e.g., CMC).

XVII: Initially applicable to Extended Studies and continuing education courses (including distance learning courses) and to those resident instruction courses into which institutions have integrated technology, the number of entire courses or courses with technology components (e.g., e-mail, threaded discussions, bulletin boards, video), some of which are included in offerings via distance learning, will increase annually by at least 10% over each two-year period to an eventual benchmark of 50% of such courses. Courses or course components may be obtained from external providers or other institutions. Institutions that are located in rural areas of the state without adequate technology infrastructure may not be benchmarked. After three years or once the benchmark of 50% is achieved for Extended Studies and continuing education courses (whichever comes first), an evaluation of the applicability of the benchmark to resident instruction courses will be made and reported to CCHE.

XVIIIA: Each institution, through its annual reporting (e.g., IPEDS, SURDS) provides data on retention and graduation rates, and transfers in and out of the institution. This data will be reviewed annually by the Q.I.S. Advisory Committee and CCHE staff in terms of improvements in retention and graduation rates, transfer rates, student success in receiving institution, and the ability to transfer without loss of credits. Particular attention will be devoted to four-, five-, and six- year graduation rates for four- year institutions, one- and two- year graduation rates for certificate students in two-year institutions, two-, three-, and four-year graduation rates for associate degree students in two-year institutions, freshmen retention and persistence, and success of transfer students in the receiving institution. Benchmarks for each measure will be established based on: (1) an analysis of the data obtained from the performance measures used during FY 1999-2000 and the data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparisons with actual data for institutions with similar roles and missions, and (3) comparisons with benchmarks established by other states for institutions with similar roles and missions.

XVIIIB: Institutions periodically gather information related to job placement and participation in further education by recent graduates. As available, this information will be reviewed by the Q.I.S. Advisory Committee and CCHE staff to determine if benchmarks are appropriate.

XVIIIC: Benchmarks for retention and persistence rates for first-time freshmen from one fall semester to the next fall semester will be established based on: (1) an analysis of data obtained from the performance measures used during FY 1999-2000 and the data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparison with actual data for institutions with similar roles and missions, and (3) comparison with benchmarks established by other states for institutions with similar roles and missions.

XIXC: Paralleling the statutory requirement for teacher education programs outlined in SB 99-154 (i.e., programs completed in four years), benchmarks will be established for the percentage of arts & sciences, business, journalism and liberal arts degree programs requiring no more than 60 credits (A.A. and A.S. degree programs) and 120 credits (baccalaureate degree programs) for graduation. Degree programs with course and program standards associated with accreditation or professional association guidelines that specify competency or outcome requirements necessitating more credits beyond 60 or 120 for degree completion are excluded. The benchmarks will be based on: (1) an analysis of the data obtained from the performance measures used during FY 1999-2000 and the data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparisons with actual data of institutions with similar roles and missions, and (3) comparison with benchmarks established by other states for institutions with similar roles and missions.

XIXD: Benchmarks will be established for the percentage of transfer students who earn a GPA during their second semester of attendance at the receiving institution at least equal to the average GPA of their class cohort of native students at the receiving institution. The benchmarks will be based on: (1) an analysis of SURDS data and data acquired during the HB 1289 study, (2) comparisons with actual data of institutions with similar roles and missions, and (3) comparison with benchmarks established by other states for institutions with similar roles and missions. [For TWO-YEAR institutions]

XX: At least 50% of all academic research done by faculty that is supported by state funds or tuition dollars will include a component meant to impact teaching and learning.

INSTITUTIONAL ACTIVITIES ALREADY UNDERWAY

Institutional activity related to several of the measures is already underway.

Indicator ID: Internal Transfer Guides To Ensure That Students Do Not, For Inappropriate Reasons, Lose Credit Hours When Changing Degree Programs

Institutions have developed and made available to undergraduate students internal transfer guides listing transferable courses by degree program. Institutions have implemented activities aimed at reviewing these transfer guides to accommodate publication via the WWW, if appropriate. Once every three years, the institution will survey its students regarding the effectiveness of the transfer guides.

Indicator III: Student Advising Systems Providing Complete Information to Students

Institutions have always provided their students with advising. Increased attetnion targeted on improving advising has been initiated. During the forthcoming year, the Colorado Student Association's Academic Advising Policy will be added as a guideline to advising systems. Once every three years, the institution, with the involvement of the institution's student body, will conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of its advising system. The results will be shared with the respective governing board and CCHE.

Indicator VIIA: Scholarship Program to Increase Participation by Low-Income Students

Institutions have already implemented the Governor's Opportunity Scholarship Program (GOS). During the forthcoming year, institutions will work to increase qualified student participation in GOS.

Indicator VIIB: Pre-College Programs to Enhance Preparation for College

Institutions have offered pre-college programs to prospective students to enhance their preparation for the college experience. During the forthcoming year, institutions will seek to expand their efforts through collaboration with other institutions and/or the private sector.

Indicator XIC: Assessment of Foundational Skills and General Literacy Competence

During AY 2000-01, several institutions will pilot test various programs for assessing foundational skills and general literacy competency of students nearing completion of the institution's general education program. Full implementation of the assessment will follow the period of pilot testing.

Indicator XVII: Increased Incorporation of Technology into Courses and Classes.

Institutions have been utilizing technology in the teaching of numerous courses. Some of these courses are also provided on-line. Focusing first on courses offered through the Extended Studies and Continuing Education programs, institutions will increase the use of technology including, but not limited to, on-line courses. In subsequent years, institutions will increase the utilization of technology in at least 50% of the courses offered.

Indicator XVIIIB: Surveys of Employers and Alumni Regarding Adequacy of Preparation for Employment.

Institutions are engaged in surveying employers and alumni regarding their satisfaction with the education and preparation for employment provided by the institution. These surveys will be administered at least once every three years.

Indicator XIXC: Baccalaureate Degree Programs Limited to 120 Credits; Associate Degree Programs (A.A. and A.S.) Limited to 60 Credits.

Four-year institutions are already reviewing their curricula to incorporate revisions resulting in a 120-credit limitation to the number of credits required for a baccalaureate degree in certain discipline fields. Two-year institutions are doing a similar review of the A.A. and A.S. degree programs for a 60-credit limitation.